



**Town of Hilton Head Island**  
**Regular Planning Commission Meeting**  
**Wednesday, December 19, 2012**  
**3:00p.m. Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers**  
**AGENDA**

---

As a Courtesy to Others Please Turn Off All Cell Phones and Pagers during the Meeting.

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**
- 3. Roll Call**
- 4. Freedom of Information Act Compliance**  
Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.
- 5. Approval of Agenda**
- 6. Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting December 5, 2012**
- 7. Appearance by Citizens on Items Unrelated to Today's Agenda**
- 8. Unfinished Business**  
**None**
- 9. New Business**  
**Public Hearing**  
**STRNM120003** – Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of First Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 27-37, 59, and 60. The proposed name is Sea Font Lane.  
*Presented by: Randy Lindstrom*  
  
**STRNM120004**– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Second Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort Country Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 39-45, 61-65, 75, 504 and 151. The proposed name is Sandy Beach Trail.  
*Presented by: Randy Lindstrom*  
  
**STRNM120005**– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Third Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 46-51 and 66-69. The proposed name is Barrier Beach Cove.  
*Presented by: Randy Lindstrom*  
  
**STRNM120006**– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Fourth Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 52-56 and 70-71. The proposed name is Shore Crest Lane.  
*Presented by: Randy Lindstrom*

**STRNM120007** – Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Fifth Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 72-73, 337-339, 22F, 616, 606, 218, and 122. The proposed name is Surf Watch Way. *Presented by: Randy Lindstrom*

**PPR120009** – Application for Public Project Review from the Town of Hilton Head Island for Coligny District Improvements. The project includes roadway and pedestrian crossing improvements, a central park space, pathways, picnic shelters, restrooms, streetscape and lighting improvements, parking, and facilities to partner with the University of South Carolina Beaufort. *Please note: This application has been withdrawn by staff.*

**10. Commission Business**

Planning Commission letter to Town Council for PPR120007 – Chaplin Linear Park

**11. Chairman’s Report**

**12. Committee Reports**

**13. Staff Reports**

**14. Adjournment**

Please note that a quorum of Town Council may result if four or more of their members attend this meeting.

**\* Upcoming Meetings**

- 1) Regular Planning Commission Meeting - January 2, 2013 at 9:00.a.m.
- 2) Regular Planning Commission Meeting – January 16, 2013 at 3:00p.m.

\* Please visit the Town’s website for complete and up-to-date information on all meetings.

1 **TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND**  
2 **Regular Planning Commission**  
3 **Wednesday, December 5, 2012 Meeting**  
4 **9:00a.m – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers**

**DRAFT**

5  
6  
7  
8 Commissioners Present: Chairman Gail Quick, Vice Chairman Tom Lennox, David Bennett,  
9 Alex Brown, Jack Docherty, Terry Ennis, Bryan Hughes, Barry Taylor,  
10 and Brian Witmer

11  
12 Commissioners Absent: None

13  
14 Town Council Present: George Williams

15  
16 Town Staff Present: Shawn Colin, Manager of Comprehensive Planning  
17 Charles Cousins, Director of Community Development  
18 Jayme Lopko, Senior Planner & Planning Commission Coordinator  
19 Kathleen Carlin, Secretary  
20

21 **1. Call to Order**

22 **2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**

23 **3. Roll Call**

24 **4. Freedom of Information Act Compliance**

25 Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and mailed in compliance with  
26 the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.

27 **5. Approval of Agenda**

28 The agenda was **approved** as presented by general consent.

29 **6. Approval of Minutes**

30 The Planning Commission **approved** the minutes of the November 21, 2012 meeting as  
31 presented by general consent.

32 **7. Appearance by Citizens on Items Unrelated to Today's Agenda**

33 None

34 **8. Unfinished Business**

35 None

36 **9. New Business**

37 **Public Hearing**

38 **PPR120007** – Application for Public Project Review from the Town of Hilton Head Island  
39 to construct a linear park connecting the proposed Shelter Cove Waterfront Park with Collier  
40 Beach Park that will include multi-purpose pathways and boardwalks, parking  
41 improvements, restroom facilities and emergency access. Chairman Quick introduced the  
42 application and opened the public hearing. Chairman Quick then requested that the staff  
43 make their presentation.  
44

1 Mr. Shawn Colin made the presentation on behalf of staff. Staff recommended that the  
2 Planning Commission find this application to be compatible with the Town's Comprehensive  
3 Plan for location, character and extent based on the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of  
4 Law as determined by the LMO Official. Mr. Colin reminded the Planning Commission that  
5 they are reviewing this project for compatibility with the Town's Comprehensive Plan for  
6 location, character and extent based on the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law.  
7

8 Mr. Colin stated the definition of a linear park. The linear park is a greenway primarily made  
9 up of open space along waterways taking advantage of water features that includes both  
10 planned pathways, planned connections and linking other parks together with residential and  
11 business components.  
12

13 Mr. Colin stated that the concept of developing a linear park mid-island in the Chaplin area  
14 has been recommended in multiple plans adopted by the Town as a guide to development.  
15 The Chaplin Area Initiative Plan was adopted in 2002 and recommends that the Town create  
16 a passive linear park system linking the Town-owned lands to provide access to residential  
17 and commercial developments along Broad Creek to extend to Shelter Cove.  
18

19 The 2002 Broad Creek Management Plan also recommends acquiring properties along Broad  
20 Creek for open space and recreation purposes. In 2010, when the Town adopted the most  
21 recent Comprehensive Plan, Chaplin Linear Park was identified as a future park facility in  
22 the Chaplin area. As a result, the Town has acquired the majority of properties needed to  
23 develop the linear park.  
24

25 The redevelopment of the Mall at Shelter Cove offers the opportunity to leverage public and  
26 private investment to create Chaplin Linear Park. The proposed Shelter Cove Waterfront  
27 Park, approved as PPR120003, would anchor the park on one end and Collier Beach Park,  
28 approved as PPR01-99 on the other and provide a unique beach to creek experience. In  
29 pursuit of this opportunity, Town Council identified Chaplin Linear Park as a "2012 Target  
30 for Action" and approved moving forward with the design, permitting and construction of the  
31 park.  
32

33 Mr. Colin presented an in-depth overhead review of the application including a site map and  
34 project map. The project is located in the Shelter Cove and Chaplin areas. It would link the  
35 proposed Shelter Cove Waterfront Park with Collier Beach Park through the use of multi-  
36 purpose pathways, boardwalks and pedestrian bridges that take advantage of the natural  
37 resources of the project area, highlighting scenic views and increasing access to open space  
38 that creates the opportunity for environmental education and recreational experiences. The  
39 project will also include parking and restrooms at various locations, including Shelter Cove  
40 Lane and off Burkes Beach Road. An at-grade crosswalk is proposed at the road crossing at  
41 Singleton Beach Road. The project will be designed to minimize impacts on natural  
42 resources and enhance the quality of open spaces and character of the Chaplin area.  
43

44 The staff finds the application to be compatible with natural resources, community facilities,  
45 transportation, and recreation elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The staff has received a  
46 good deal of public comment on this application. The majority of the comments were related  
47 to the area of Collier Beach Park. Some comments regarding the boardwalk connection  
48 between Collier Beach Park and Burkes Beach Road were also received. Most comments

1 regarding the boardwalk connection have been positive. At the completion of staff's  
2 presentation, Chairman Quick requested public comments and the following were received:  
3

4 (1) Mrs. Julie Hallquist, resident of the Singleton Beach neighborhood and member of the  
5 Folly Inlet Initiative, presented statements in concern of the 1999 Collier Beach Park  
6 approval and environmental impacts. Mrs. Hallquist stated that that the group is in  
7 agreement with plans for Chaplin Linear Park; the boardwalk is great, but the impact to  
8 Collier Beach Park cannot be excluded from the discussion. There are three main points in  
9 concern of Collier Beach Park. The first concern is the environment; the second concern is  
10 the proposed handicap parking due to contaminants; and the third concern is the safety of  
11 pedestrians on Singleton Beach Road.

12 (2) Mr. Frank Babel, citizen, presented statements in support of the proposed pathway  
13 project. The program opens up the vista to Broad Creek; the boardwalk will be a great  
14 addition for bicyclists.  
15

16 (3) Chester C. Williams, Esq., presented public comments on behalf of his client, Singleton  
17 Place Homeowners Association. Mr. Williams stated that he believes the scope of the  
18 Planning Commission's review is not limited to location, character and extent for  
19 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. According to State Statutes for the review of  
20 public projects, the Planning Commission is charged with the review of public projects for  
21 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan once the location, character, and extent of the  
22 projects has been presented. The Planning Commission is not limited to what the location,  
23 character, and extent are. The Planning Commission's authority extends to compliance for  
24 the total project with the Comprehensive Plan.  
25

26 Mr. Williams discussed the history of the application including the Planning's Commission  
27 approval of the original plan in 1999. The scope of this project has changed since the  
28 introduction of the Chaplin Linear Park. Today's application is deficient in not including the  
29 Collier Beach Park because it includes a great deal more than the pathway. Mr. Williams  
30 discussed his client's concerns with tidal flooding in the area. Mr. Williams presented  
31 several photos of flooding in the area which occurs several times a year. Mr. Williams also  
32 presented a site plan and several documents resulting from the Planning Commission's  
33 review and approval dated 1999. Mr. Williams stated that the Planning Commission needs to  
34 restudy the scope of what is being planned because what is being proposed today is very  
35 different. The Linear Park does have some great elements to it but the Planning Commission  
36 needs to receive additional information from staff as it relates to the character and the extent  
37 of this project, and the effect that it will have on Collier Beach Park. This application should  
38 not be allowed to move forward until all of the necessary information is received by the  
39 Planning Commission.  
40

41 (4) Ms. Helen Ford, area property owner, presented statements in concern of how the  
42 application will affect her property, particularly related to the location of the sidewalk. Mr.  
43 Colin presented an overhead map of the area showing the location of Ms. Ford's property.  
44 The application is not expected to impact Ms. Ford's property because all of the proposed  
45 changes and improvements, including to the sidewalk, are within the existing DOT right-of-  
46 way. Chairman Quick encouraged Ms. Ford to meet with the staff on site for a better  
47 understanding of any potential impact.  
48

1 (5) Mr. Reid Armstrong, member of the Coastal Conservation League, presented statements  
2 regarding the Planning Commission's need for additional information on the application,  
3 particularly as it relates to impacting the Collier Beach area.  
4

5 (6) Mr. Terry Herron, property owner in the area, presented statements in concern of the  
6 regular flooding in this area and the potential for contaminates to the area.  
7

8 (7) Ms. Theresa Baker, resident of Palmetto Dunes, presented statements in concern of the  
9 loss of natural beauty in this area, the negative impact on natural resources, and effects on the  
10 ecosystem in the folly. This area is pristine, beautiful and should not be contaminated.  
11

12 At the completion of all public comments, Chairman Quick stated that the public hearing for  
13 this application is closed.  
14

15 Chairman Quick then stated that the question before the Planning Commission is whether or  
16 not this application is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to location,  
17 character, and extent. Chairman Quick invited comments from each Planning Commissioner  
18 and the following statements were received:  
19

20 Commissioner Bennett stated that he has several concerns with this application. It is difficult  
21 to separate this application from the access to Collier Beach Park. Commissioner Bennett  
22 discussed his concerns with the narrow road conditions, the additional traffic, the parking lot,  
23 problems with flooding to the area, and with environmental issues. Commissioner Bennett  
24 stated that the Planning Commission needs to receive additional information from the staff in  
25 order to have a better understanding of the pros and cons. The Planning Commission should  
26 ask Town Council to reconsider the plan and improvements for this park as there are some  
27 serious concerns at this time.  
28

29 Commission Hughes agreed with the comments and concerns presented by Commissioner  
30 Bennett. Commissioner Brown presented statements in concern of safety issues in the area,  
31 particularly related to the additional vehicular traffic, pedestrians, and bicyclists.  
32

33 Commissioner Docherty presented statements in support of the Planning Commission's  
34 approval of the application, particularly as it relates to handicap access to the water.  
35 Chairman Quick requested clarification from Mr. Shawn Colin regarding the approval  
36 process and next steps for the application. Mr. Colin stated that Town Council has already  
37 approved the Conceptual plan, and the application does not go back to Town Council. The  
38 next steps for this project are the design and permitting phase.  
39

40 Mr. Colin stated that most of the public comments that have been received today seem to  
41 point to concerns with the validity of the 1999 Collier Beach Park plan. The staff has not  
42 heard anything today that is inconsistent with approval of the public project application as it  
43 relates to location, character, and extent. Mr. Colin stated that the comments from the  
44 Planning Commission are valid and they relate more to the Collier Beach Park than the  
45 Chaplin Linear Park.  
46

47 The Planning Commission and the staff discussed the approval process for public project  
48 review applications. Mr. Colin reminded the Planning Commission that applications for

1 public project review are decided by the Planning Commission and are not forwarded to  
2 Town Council for their approval.

3  
4 Commissioner Ennis presented statements regarding the Planning Commission's role in  
5 deciding whether or not this application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.  
6 Commissioner Ennis presented statements regarding his involvement in serving on the  
7 Comprehensive Plan Committee. The Comprehensive Plan is not a precise goal relative to  
8 the points being discussed today. It is conceptual – there is no precision. Commissioner  
9 Ennis stated that he looks at these ideas and then breaks them down to their individual  
10 components. Conceptually the proposed connectivity from the mall and down to the beach is  
11 a very good idea, and it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. However, when you start  
12 breaking it down to individual components, it becomes more complicated.

13  
14 Commissioner Ennis stated that elevation would be a good idea, and the towers are a good  
15 idea for views of the water. But when we split the proposal down further, and we start to  
16 look at the boardwalk across the marsh, it becomes iffy. Commissioner Ennis stated that  
17 there may be a better way of connecting to the beach. These questions go beyond the  
18 conceptual level and become much more specific. Commissioner Ennis stated that from an  
19 idea standpoint, it does not seem like a good idea to place restroom facilities on Collier  
20 Beach.

21  
22 Commissioner Ennis stated that he agrees with Commissioner Bennett's comments in that the  
23 concepts are good and the connectivity makes sense. Except when you talk about  
24 connectivity, where does it connect to? This is another issue and crossing the marsh is not a  
25 good idea. Also, putting facilities on Collier Beach is not a good idea, even though it has  
26 been passed. Commissioner Ennis asked where does the Planning Commission go from  
27 here? The simple answer is since the Planning Commission is only looking at the  
28 connectivity issue, and at the conceptual level, they could approve the application based on  
29 location, character and extent, but that doesn't seem quite right either. Chairman Quick  
30 stated that she agrees with Commissioner Ennis' concerns.

31  
32 Commissioner Bennett stated that he agrees with Commissioner Ennis regarding trying to  
33 break the application down to its component parts. The first category seems to be the  
34 improvements, the trail and the pathway connecting Shelter Cove up to Chaplin Park. The  
35 second category seems to be the improvements proposed for Chaplin Park, and the third  
36 category seems to be the connection from Chaplin to Collier. It is the third category that is  
37 troublesome due to concerns with the environment. Hopefully, there is a better way to make  
38 the connection from Chaplin to Collier. The pathways connection is a good idea. However,  
39 one significant concern is the 300-foot segment that abuts Highway 278. The sidewalk is too  
40 narrow in this location and not wide enough for two-way passage. There should be some sort  
41 of buffer and the pathway should be a minimum of eight feet wide for safety.

42  
43 Commissioner Witmer stated that he hopes the staff has heard all of the Planning  
44 Commission's concerns that have been presented today. Additional information is needed  
45 from the staff and Town Council should be made aware of the Planning Commission's  
46 concerns.

47  
48 Commissioner Taylor presented statements with regard to next steps for the application. The  
49 Planning Commission is not charged with the task of looking at the details for the project.

1 Commissioner Taylor stated that community input will be considered in the design of the  
2 project.

3  
4 Vice Chairman Lennox stated that the public project review application gets its genesis in the  
5 Land Management Ordinance. This is where the Planning Commission is given the charge in  
6 determining whether the application is consistent given the location, character, and extent of  
7 the project. However, it goes beyond that. Under some of the submission requirements, the  
8 public project review application is to be judged as to its compatibility with the neighborhood  
9 in which it is proposed and the pre-development characteristics of the site or sites on which it  
10 is to be located. So the Planning Commission should take into consideration all of the sites,  
11 including the 300-foot pathway mentioned earlier by Commissioner Bennett, in which this  
12 Linear Park will come into contact with. It is this consideration that gives me cause to think  
13 more about Collier Beach – is the application compatible with that neighborhood? The  
14 Planning Commission is hearing a good deal of public concern on this issue. Vice Chairman  
15 Lennox also presented statements regarding the OCRM baseline and the setback  
16 requirements. The most recent information we have to deal with on this issue suggests that a  
17 lot of the concerns that we have about Collier Beach may be prohibited from being  
18 constructed.

19  
20 If so, and if Collier Beach would remain as it exists, the access to Collier Beach from  
21 Chaplin seems to be more acceptable now than it would have been before. Perhaps the focus  
22 should be specifically on the linear park connectivity that we are being asked to consider and  
23 move on as it is proposed given what we currently have for the OCRM baseline. Vice  
24 Chairman Lennox agreed with Commissioner Docherty's comments regarding the need to  
25 move this application forward.

26  
27 Chairman Quick stated that she shares many of the concerns that have been brought forward  
28 today. Chairman Quick stated that her overall concern is protection of the environment. The  
29 Planning Commission needs to protect the users of this project and we need to protect the  
30 Town. Chairman Quick stated that she also has concerns with safety issues and with the  
31 connectivity between Chaplin Park and Collier Beach. Chairman Quick stated that she is  
32 opposed to putting any type of boardwalk or bridge across the marsh. Instead we should  
33 consider placing pedestrian connectivity as close as possible to the hard land around the folly  
34 to get to Collier. Any structure that is put over the marsh will damage the animal life and  
35 natural vegetation that exists there. This area is almost spiritual in natural and it is the last  
36 view we have of the marsh. This environment needs to be protected as existing. The concept  
37 needs to change from connecting people from Shelter Cove Mall to the beach to an  
38 experience of environmental education for visitors and residents alike. The pedestrian  
39 pathways should be made specifically for that in that they follow the land as much as  
40 possible. The connectivity to Collier Beach is of concern and what happened back in 1999  
41 needs to be revisited.

42  
43 Chairman Quick also stated that she is concerned about next steps for this project. The  
44 Planning Commission is asking the staff to consider today's comments and concerns. The  
45 Planning Commission does not have sufficient information today to determine if this project  
46 is compatible with the existing Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission needs to  
47 have more detail in order to be sure that all of the points discussed today are included in the  
48 Town's Request for Proposals that will go out for this project.

49

1 Mr. Charles Cousins presented statements in clarification of the next steps for this project.  
2 Mr. Cousins stated that Town Council has asked that this public project be brought forward.  
3 The application does not go back to Town Council. The application is brought before the  
4 Planning Commission as a procedure step in this process. The Planning Commission needs to  
5 decide whether or not the application meets the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan.  
6

7 Mr. Cousins stated that if the Planning Commission does not believe the application meets  
8 the Comprehensive Plan, they need to state that. The staff needs to respect the property  
9 rights of Ms. Ford with regard to the narrow sidewalk. The staff understands the safety  
10 concerns and they will work with Ms. Ford on this issue. Mr. Cousins recommended that if  
11 the Planning Commission has concerns regarding Collier Beach, they should write a letter to  
12 Town Council stating their concerns and request that this situation be analyzed. Mr. Cousins  
13 stated that the Planning Commission should make a ruling on what is before them today  
14 which is the connectivity project. Mr. Cousins stated that Town Council is well aware of the  
15 public's concerns with Collier Beach, and has directed the staff to move forward with the  
16 application that is presented today. The issue before the Planning Commission is the  
17 connectivity project. Mr. Cousins requested that the Planning Commission comment on the  
18 application that is before them so that staff has a determination of how to move forward.  
19

20 Chairman Quick stated that she disagrees with Mr. Cousins' statement that Town Council has  
21 already heard all of the information and all of the concerns that are being presented at today's  
22 meeting. Chairman Quick did agree that a letter to Town Council from the Planning  
23 Commission that includes all of their concerns with Collier Beach is an appropriate action.  
24

25 Chairman Quick stated that the Planning Commission needs to make a decision on their  
26 difference of opinion with the staff. Chairman Quick stated that, in her mind, the Town  
27 Council has approved the conceptual plan, and the role of the Planning Commission is to  
28 hear public comments, ask questions, and receive information regarding the validity of the  
29 project, and how to carry out the project. The Planning Commission is not supposed to just  
30 rubber stamp the project. Chairman Quick stated that while this is a wonderful project in  
31 many ways, she believes that it is the role of the Planning Commission to ask the questions  
32 and obtain the information that the public has a right to know. It is important to remember  
33 that this is the last time that the Planning Commission and the public will have an  
34 opportunity to comment on this project other than if there are open hearings by the design  
35 charettes.  
36

37 Commissioner Hughes stated that since there is no objection to the pathway up to the 300-ft.  
38 area, would it be possible for the Planning Commission to approve the application up to that  
39 point and leave the rest to another time?  
40

41 Commissioner Ennis stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to make a  
42 determination on a Qualitative Assessment. The conceptual level is not that precise. The  
43 connectivity all of the way up to Chaplin Park is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.  
44 However, once you go beyond that from Chaplin Park to Collier Beach, it becomes very iffy.  
45 Commissioner Ennis stated that he agrees with Commissioner Hughes' comment regarding a  
46 partial approval of the application. This might be an appropriate action for the Planning  
47 Commission to take.  
48

1 Commissioner Bennett stated that he does not believe that the Planning Commission has  
2 enough data to measure the character and the extent. Commissioner Bennett then read a  
3 portion of the Comprehensive Plan, and stated that what is before the Planning Commission  
4 today is not compatible with the Comprehensive Plan due to safety concerns with the 300-ft.  
5 of sidewalk.  
6

7 Mr. Shawn Colin then read a portion of the Land Management Ordinance, Section 16-3-  
8 1204, which states that at the close of the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall  
9 determine whether the public project proposal before them is compatible with the  
10 Comprehensive Plan with regard to location, character, and extent. This determination shall  
11 include written findings. If the Planning Commission finds that the proposal conflicts with  
12 the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Commission should provide written findings that  
13 explain their reasoning. Depending on which way the Planning Commission decides, the  
14 staff will need to have documented findings on why the application is not compatible with  
15 the Comprehensive Plan at this point.  
16

17 Chairman Quick responded to Mr. Colin by stating that under Article II Authority for the  
18 Planning Commission, it states that the Planning Commission shall have jurisdiction over all  
19 the lands within the Town and that is what the Planning Commission is operating on.  
20

21 Mr. Chet Williams suggested that the Planning Commission could table the matter and tell  
22 the Town staff that they need additional information. When the Planning Commission  
23 receives the additional information from the staff, the Planning Commission could then take  
24 it up for further action.  
25

26 At the completion of all comments by the Planning Commission, Chairman Quick requested  
27 that a motion be made.  
28

29 Commissioner Hughes made a **motion** that the Planning Commission **approve** the pathway  
30 up to its terminal point once it crosses the waterway at the Cracker Barrel to the art park, and  
31 send the Collier Beach plan back to Town Council for a second look since it hasn't been  
32 reviewed since 1999.  
33

34 Commissioner Bennett requested clarification on the motion. Is the motion to approve the  
35 pathway from Shelter Cove Park to the art statues located across from the Hilton Head  
36 Resort, and send the Collier Beach plan back to Town Council for a for a second review  
37 since its last review was in 1999? Commissioner Hughes stated that this is the correct  
38 motion. Commissioner Bennet then **seconded** the motion.  
39

40 Mr. Shawn Colin stated that this action is clearly outside the scope of the Planning  
41 Commission's jurisdiction. The Planning Commission's authority is simply to determine  
42 whether or not the application before them is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan based  
43 on location, character, and extent. If there are specific items of the plan that are problematic  
44 (i.e. the 300-foot section of the sidewalk along Highway 278) that the Planning Commission  
45 feels makes it inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, that point should be stated. If the  
46 Planning Commission has issues related to other elements of the project that they find  
47 inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, those points should also be stated. The Planning  
48 Commission needs to determine the basic components of the proposed application. The  
49 determination is not to change the limits of the project.

1  
2 Commissioner Hughes and Mr. Colin discussed the actions that can be taken by the Planning  
3 Commission. Mr. Colin stated that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to  
4 segment the project as stated in the motion. The second item is a completely different issue.  
5 If the Planning Commission feels that additional consideration needs to be made at Collier  
6 Beach Park, the Planning Commission can certainly raise that issue. The Planning  
7 Commission can document their concerns to the Town Council as recommended earlier.  
8 Town Council can then direct Mr. Steve Riley to have the staff review that component.  
9

10 Mr. Colin reiterated that Collier Beach Park is not a part of the public project review  
11 application before the Planning Commission today. Whether or not there is a valid permit is  
12 a determination that needs to be made. If the Town has a valid permit, they can move  
13 forward with construction without any additional review.  
14

15 Commissioner Ennis stated that he is struggling with the idea that at the concept level you  
16 have to connect Collier Beach Park with Chaplin Park. Commissioner Ennis stated that going  
17 across the marsh is a bad idea and that whole point of destination becomes very questionable.  
18 That question can be raised by the Planning Commission without arguing the specific design  
19 within Collier Beach Park.  
20

21 Chairman Quick stated that Commissioner Ennis' point is well taken. The Planning  
22 Commission has said that this project goes from Shelter Cove Mall and connects to Collier  
23 Beach Park; therefore, Collier Beach Park has to be part of this discussion. Chairman Quick  
24 stated that she disagrees with Mr. Colin on the authority of the Planning Commission.  
25 Chairman Quick stated that, in her review of the South Carolina Code, and she has an  
26 attorney's review of that, it does not say that the Planning Commission is restricted in its  
27 authority.  
28

29 The Planning Commission discussed the motion that was made by Commissioner Hughes  
30 and seconded by Commissioner Bennett. Vice Chairman Lennox recommended that the  
31 motion be amended by expanding upon it. The Planning Commission needs to be concerned  
32 about Collier Beach, but only in the context that it is an adjacent property to the project.  
33 Vice Chairman Lennox recommended that the motion be expanded to include all of the way  
34 down to the beach. The Planning Commission should prepare a letter to Town Council  
35 itemizing all of the Planning Commission's concerns pertaining to any and all adjacent  
36 properties including Collier Beach. The Planning Commission asks that Town Council and  
37 the Town staff respond appropriately back to the Planning Commission and answer all of  
38 their concerns, including the 300-feet that parallel Highway 278, as well as any other  
39 concerns that the Planning Commission has with this project. Vice Chairman Lennox stated  
40 that he is not in favor of voting for the current motion because of its limits. Vice Chairman  
41 Lennox stated that he would be in favor of expanding the motion all of the way down to the  
42 beach with the caveat that the correspondence go to Town Council with regard to the  
43 Planning Commission's concerns.  
44

45 Chairman Quick agreed and added that the staff should return to the Planning Commission  
46 with a report to these issues. Commissioner Docherty also agreed with this action.  
47 Commissioner Ennis stated that he would **second** the amended motion. Commissioner  
48 Hughes asked if the amended motion includes all of the way down to which beach – Collier  
49 or Burkes? Vice Chairman Lennox stated that it is as proposed. Chairman Quick stated that

1 she would like to have this made part of the motion and recorded as such, in addition to  
2 writing a letter to Town Council. The Planning Commission agreed with this  
3 recommendation.  
4

5 Commissioner Taylor requested clarification on the amended motion. Commissioner Ennis  
6 stated that he thought that the amended motion stated that the connectivity be from Shelter  
7 Cove all of the way down to the beach. Commissioner Ennis stated that he believes this  
8 meets the Comprehensive Plan along the reservations discussed today. Chairman Quick  
9 stated that the Planning Commission should have their concerns listed. The staff is to come  
10 back to the Planning Commission with their response on these issues. Commissioner Taylor  
11 asked if the Planning Commission is in agreement with the connectivity as proposed today by  
12 the staff. The Planning Commission stated that they are in agreement.  
13

14 Commissioner Bennett questioned the motion because the application either is or is not in  
15 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. If some portion of the walkway is not safe, or if  
16 you think it is not safe, how can you make the determination that the entire pathway is  
17 compatible? Commissioner Ennis stated that while he agrees with Commissioner Bennett on  
18 this point, until he sees the design of the sidewalk, he cannot know whether it is safe or is not  
19 safe. Commissioner Bennett stated that the Planning Commission has concluded that there is  
20 no more right-of-way to work with to expand the width of that portion of the pathway, and  
21 we know that it is directly adjacent to Highway 278. The Planning Commission can also  
22 conclude that we should make the pathway at least eight feet wide and create a needed  
23 separation between Highway 278 and the edge of the pathway. Commissioner Ennis stated  
24 that this is a design issue. Chairman Quick stated that this should be one of the concerns  
25 included in the minutes and in the Planning Commission's letter to Town Council.  
26

27 Following final discussion by the Planning Commission, Chairman Quick requested that a  
28 vote be taken on the amended motion. Prior to the vote on the amended motion being taken,  
29 Mr. Chet Williams requested that the motion be repeated because it is confusing.  
30

31 Mr. Charles Cousins stated that there is an amendment to the motion on the floor. The  
32 Planning Commission needs to vote first on the amendment, and then they need to vote on  
33 the motion.  
34

35 Vice Chairman Lennox clarified his amendment to the motion. The amendment is to take the  
36 existing motion and expand it to include the connectivity from Chaplin all the way down to  
37 the ocean and approve that and require that the Planning Commission submit a letter to Town  
38 Council clearly defining and delineating any and all concerns that it has with regard to  
39 compatibility and safety as those concerns were mentioned at this meeting, and ask that the  
40 Town Council either directly or through the staff respond back to the Planning Commission  
41 on those concerns.  
42

43 Mr. Chet Williams asked if the amended motion and the motion include a finding that this  
44 public project application is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan or not? Vice  
45 Chairman Lennox responded that the Planning Commission would find that this application  
46 is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Quick added that this is with the  
47 reservations that need to be addressed.  
48

1 Chairman Quick then requested a vote from the Planning Commission on the amendment to  
2 the motion. The Planning Commission voted in **favor** of the amendment by a vote of 7-2-0.  
3 Commissioner Bennett and Commissioner Hughes were in opposition to the amendment.  
4

5 Chairman Quick stated that according to the Rules of Procedures, those not in favor of the  
6 motion need to state their reasons why. Commissioner Hughes stated that he is opposed to  
7 the amended motion because he is concerned with what happens once you cross Highway  
8 278. Commissioner Bennett stated that he is opposed to the amended motion because in his  
9 opinion the application does not conform with the Comprehensive Plan.  
10

11 Chairman Quick then requested a vote from the Planning Commission on the motion itself.  
12 The Planning Commission voted in **favor** of the motion by a vote of 7-2-0. Commissioner  
13 Taylor and Commissioner Bennett voted in opposition to the motion.  
14

15 Commissioner Taylor stated that he is opposed to the motion because the motion is not  
16 compatible with what was presented by staff. Commissioner Bennett stated that he agrees  
17 with Commissioner Taylor; the motion is inconsistent with the responsibilities of the  
18 Planning Commission.  
19

#### 20 **10. Commission Business**

21 Chairman Quick recommended that a Coligny Plaza site visit be arranged for the Planning  
22 Commission prior to the public hearing for the Coligny public project review application on  
23 December 19, 2012. Mr. Charles Cousins reported that staff has been asked by the Town  
24 Manager to postpone the public hearing for this application until a later date. The application  
25 will not appear on the agenda for the December 19, 2012 meeting.  
26

#### 27 **11. Chairman's Report**

28 Chairman Quick requested that the staff establish a workshop for the Planning Commission  
29 to review the initial design of the Chaplin Linear Park. Before the Chaplin Linear Park  
30 project goes before the Town Council, Chairman Quick would like a presentation to the  
31 Planning Commission. When the design is complete, staff should provide it to the Planning  
32 Commission like they did with the Shelter Cove Mall. Mr. Cousins presented statements  
33 regarding the plan's presentation to the community for public input.

#### 34 **12. Committee Reports**

35 None

#### 36 **13. Staff Reports**

37 None

38 Prior to adjournment, Mr. Chet Williams asked Chairman Quick about the timeline for the  
39 Planning Commission's drafting a letter to Town Council detailing their concerns with  
40 PPR120007. Chairman Quick presented comments regarding next steps including the staff's  
41 preparation of the meeting minutes.

42 Chairman Quick stated that she believes the Planning Commission can form a sub-committee  
43 for the purpose of drafting a letter to Town Council. Chairman Quick recommended that  
44 Vice Chairman Lennox assist with this task. All Planning Commissioners are encouraged to  
45 provide their input in the draft letter to Town Council. Mr. Chet Williams stated that he

1 would like to know when the meeting is planned so that he may have an opportunity to  
2 attend.

3 Mr. Charles Cousins stated that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to form  
4 a sub-committee without the Mayor's approval. Mr. Cousins stated that the staff would be  
5 happy to draft a letter on behalf of the Planning Commission based on today's meeting  
6 minutes. The staff could then forward the draft letter to Chairman Quick and the Planning  
7 Commission for their input. Chairman Quick agreed with the staff's suggestion.  
8

9 **14. Adjournment**

10 The meeting was adjourned at 10:30a.m.

11 Submitted By:

Approved By:

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Kathleen Carlin  
14 Secretary

15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Gail Quick  
Chairman



**TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

One Town Center Court	Hilton Head Island, SC 29928	843-341-4757	FAX 843-842-8908
-----------------------	------------------------------	--------------	------------------

**STAFF REPORT  
MODIFIED STREET NAME APPLICATION**

<b>Case #:</b>	<b>Name of Project or Development:</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>
STRNM120003	Burkes Beach Property Owner's Association (POA)	December 19, 2012

<b>Parcel Data or Location:</b>	<b>Applicant/Agent</b>
R511 012 000 0537 0000	Burkes Beach POA PO Box 4710 Hilton Head Island, SC 29938

**Application Summary:**

STRNM120003– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of First Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 27-37, 59, and 60. The proposed name is Sea Font Lane.

**Staff Recommendation:**

**Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the Sea Front Lane modified street name application based on the review criterion outlined in the Land Management Ordinance and enclosed herein.**

**Background:**

The current street names in the Burkes Beach Subdivision are more suitable for businesses and not a beach community. With the close proximity to the ocean, the subdivision would like to have more beach oriented names. These names are also unique and would help with safety response and deliveries.

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

**Findings of Facts:**

- Notice of the Modified Street Name Application was published in the Island Packet on November 11, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- Notice of the New Access Easement application was posted and mailed as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- A public hearing will be held on December 19, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1104A.
- The Commission has authority to render their decision reached here in LMO Section 16-3-1101B.

**Conclusions of Law:**

The Modified Street Name, notice requirements, and public hearing comply with the legal requirements as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111 and 16-3-1104A.

*As set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1105, Criteria for New or Modified Street and Vehicular Access Easement Names, requires that the Planning Commission, for final action, review proposed street names. This section also sets forth the criteria for this review as indicated below.*

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

*Criteria A: No new street, vehicular access easement or development project name, or proposed modified name of an existing street, vehicular access easement or development, except phases of the same development project, shall duplicate, be phonetically similar to, or in any way be likely to be confused with an existing street, vehicular access easement or development name, in spite of the use of prefixes or suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch and Beaufort County Dispatch have reviewed the proposed Sea Front Lane and have found that it does not duplicate street, vehicular access easement or development names.**

*Criteria B: It is desirable to use names which are simple, logical, easy to read and pronounce and which are clear and brief. Use of frivolous or complicated words or unconventional spellings in names shall not be approved.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that the proposed Sea Front Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria C: It is desirable to use names which have some association with Hilton Head Island and specifically with the immediate location of the road or place, such as reference to local history or physiographic features.*

**This will bring the names in more compliance with the physiographic features of Hilton Head Island.**

*Criteria D: Use of a common theme is recommended for names of streets which are associated with one another, such as those within a residential development.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sea Front Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria E: Intersecting streets or vehicular access easements shall not have the same or similar name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sea Front Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria F: Streets or vehicular access easements which continue through an intersection should generally bear the same name, except where the road crosses a major arterial or where existing address points on a street require that the roadway be given a different name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria G: A street or vehicular access easement making an approximate right-angle turn where there is no possibility of extending the street or vehicular access easement in either direction shall be considered to be continuous and be so named. Where there is a choice of direction or a possibility of extending either section in the future, such configuration shall be considered to be an intersection and different names assigned.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria H: The proposed name of the development should in all respects emphasize the project's distinctive name rather than the name of the company or corporation that owns the development. This will reduce confusion on the location of separate developments owned by the same company or corporation.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*I. New or modified street names should generally use Drive, Lane, Place, Road, Street or Way as suffixes. The following street designations should only be used if the street design meets one of the following descriptions:*

- 1. Alley--A street providing access to the rear of lots or buildings, usually as a secondary means of access to a property.*
- 2. Avenue--A street that is continuous.*
- 3. Boulevard--A street with a landscaped median dividing the roadway.*
- 4. Circle--A street with a complete loop on the end or a side street that intersects another street at two adjacent intersections.*
- 5. Court--A street terminating in a cul-de-sac, not longer than 1,000 feet in length.*
- 6. Extension--A section of street forming an additional length.*
- 7. Parkway--A street designated as a collector or arterial road, with a landscaped median reflecting the parkway character implied in the name.*

*This list is not intended to limit the use of other appropriate suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sea Front Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*J. The suffixes Manor, Trace and Common shall typically be used to name vehicular access easements.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*K. Existing roads that become broken by natural barriers, intervening land uses, or development that cause the existing road to become two separate roads, and are not likely to be reconnected in the future, shall be named in a manner that considers the potential economic impact of the number of address points and type of addresses impacted.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

**PREPARED BY:**

---

Suzanne Brown  
*Addressing Technician*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Randy Lindstrom  
*Administrative Battalion Chief*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Jayne Lopko, AICP  
*Planning Commission Coordinator &  
Senior Planner*

---

DATE



**TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

One Town Center Court	Hilton Head Island, SC 29928	843-341-4757	FAX 843-842-8908
-----------------------	------------------------------	--------------	------------------

**STAFF REPORT  
MODIFIED STREET NAME APPLICATION**

<b>Case #:</b>	<b>Name of Project or Development:</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>
STRNM120004	Burkes Beach Property Owner's Association (POA)	December 19, 2012

<b>Parcel Data or Location:</b>	<b>Applicant/Agent</b>
R511 012 000 0065 0000	Burkes Beach POA PO Box 4710 Hilton Head Island, SC 29938

**Application Summary:**

STRNM120004– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Second Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort Country Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 39-45, 61-65, 75, 504, and 151 The proposed name is Sandy Beach Trail.

**Staff Recommendation:**

**Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the Sandy Beach Trail modified street name application based on the review criterion outlined in the Land Management Ordinance and enclosed herein.**

**Background:**

The current street names in the Burkes Beach Subdivision are more suitable for businesses and not a beach community. With the close proximity to the ocean, the subdivision would like to have more beach oriented names. These names are also unique and would help with safety response and deliveries.

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

**Findings of Facts:**

- Notice of the Modified Street Name Application was published in the Island Packet on November 11, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- Notice of the New Access Easement application was posted and mailed as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- A public hearing will be held on December 19, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1104A.
- The Commission has authority to render their decision reached here in LMO Section 16-3-1101B.

**Conclusions of Law:**

The Modified Street Name, notice requirements, and public hearing comply with the legal requirements as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111 and 16-3-1104A.

*As set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1105, Criteria for New or Modified Street and Vehicular Access Easement Names, requires that the Planning Commission, for final action, review proposed street names. This section also sets forth the criteria for this review as indicated below.*

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

*Criteria A: No new street, vehicular access easement or development project name, or proposed modified name of an existing street, vehicular access easement or development, except phases of the same development project, shall duplicate, be phonetically similar to, or in any way be likely to be confused with an existing street, vehicular access easement or development name, in spite of the use of prefixes or suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch and Beaufort County Dispatch have reviewed the proposed Sandy Beach Trail and have found that it does not duplicate street, vehicular access easement or development names.**

*Criteria B: It is desirable to use names which are simple, logical, easy to read and pronounce and which are clear and brief. Use of frivolous or complicated words or unconventional spellings in names shall not be approved.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sandy Beach Trail meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria C: It is desirable to use names which have some association with Hilton Head Island and specifically with the immediate location of the road or place, such as reference to local history or physiographic features.*

**This will bring the names in more compliance with the physiographic features of Hilton Head Island.**

*Criteria D: Use of a common theme is recommended for names of streets which are associated with one another, such as those within a residential development.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sandy Beach Trail meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria E: Intersecting streets or vehicular access easements shall not have the same or similar name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sandy Beach Trail meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria F: Streets or vehicular access easements which continue through an intersection should generally bear the same name, except where the road crosses a major arterial or where existing address points on a street require that the roadway be given a different name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does apply to this application. Currently Castnet Drive turns into Second Street crossing Burkes Beach Road. This would be an exception to keep with the beach theme of the Burkes Beach Community and would affect 15 address numbers that currently exist.**

*Criteria G: A street or vehicular access easement making an approximate right-angle turn where there is no possibility of extending the street or vehicular access easement in either direction shall be considered to be continuous and be so named. Where there is a choice of direction or a possibility of extending either section in the future, such configuration shall be considered to be an intersection and different names assigned.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria H: The proposed name of the development should in all respects emphasize the project's distinctive name rather than the name of the company or corporation that owns the development. This will reduce confusion on the location of separate developments owned by the same company or corporation.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*I. New or modified street names should generally use Drive, Lane, Place, Road, Street or Way as suffixes. The following street designations should only be used if the street design meets one of the following descriptions:*

- 1. Alley--A street providing access to the rear of lots or buildings, usually as a secondary means of access to a property.*
- 2. Avenue--A street that is continuous.*
- 3. Boulevard--A street with a landscaped median dividing the roadway.*
- 4. Circle--A street with a complete loop on the end or a side street that intersects another street at two adjacent intersections.*
- 5. Court--A street terminating in a cul-de-sac, not longer than 1,000 feet in length.*
- 6. Extension--A section of street forming an additional length.*
- 7. Parkway--A street designated as a collector or arterial road, with a landscaped median reflecting the parkway character implied in the name.*

*This list is not intended to limit the use of other appropriate suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Sandy Beach Trail meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*J. The suffixes Manor, Trace and Common shall typically be used to name vehicular access easements.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*K. Existing roads that become broken by natural barriers, intervening land uses, or development that cause the existing road to become two separate roads, and are not likely to be reconnected in the future, shall be named in a manner that considers the potential economic impact of the number of address points and type of addresses impacted.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

**PREPARED BY:**

---

Suzanne Brown  
*Addressing Technician*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Randy Lindstrom  
*Administrative Battalion Chief*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Jayne Lopko, AICP  
*Planning Commission Coordinator &  
Senior Planner*

---

DATE



**TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

One Town Center Court	Hilton Head Island, SC 29928	843-341-4757	FAX 843-842-8908
-----------------------	------------------------------	--------------	------------------

**STAFF REPORT  
MODIFIED STREET NAME APPLICATION**

<b>Case #:</b>	<b>Name of Project or Development:</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>
STRNM120005	Burkes Beach Property Owner's Association (POA)	December 19, 2012

<b>Parcel Data or Location:</b>	<b>Applicant/Agent</b>
R511 012 000 0537 0000	Burkes Beach POA PO Box 4710 Hilton Head Island, SC 29938

**Application Summary:**

STRNM120005– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Third Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 46-51 and 66-69. The proposed name is Barrier Beach Cove.

**Staff Recommendation:**

**Staff recommends the Planning Commission *approve* the Barrier Beach Cove modified street name application based on the review criterion outlined in the Land Management Ordinance and enclosed herein.**

**Background:**

The current street names in the Burkes Beach Subdivision are more suitable for businesses and not a beach community. With the close proximity to the ocean, the subdivision would like to have more beach oriented names. These names are also unique and would help with safety response and deliveries.

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

**Findings of Facts:**

- Notice of the Modified Street Name Application was published in the Island Packet on November 11, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- Notice of the New Access Easement application was posted and mailed as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- A public hearing will be held on December 19, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1104A.
- The Commission has authority to render their decision reached here in LMO Section 16-3-1101B.

**Conclusions of Law:**

The Modified Street Name, notice requirements, and public hearing comply with the legal requirements as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111 and 16-3-1104A.

*As set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1105, Criteria for New or Modified Street and Vehicular Access Easement Names, requires that the Planning Commission, for final action, review proposed street names. This section also sets forth the criteria for this review as indicated below.*

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

*Criteria A: No new street, vehicular access easement or development project name, or proposed modified name of an existing street, vehicular access easement or development, except phases of the same development project, shall duplicate, be phonetically similar to, or in any way be likely to be confused with an existing street, vehicular access easement or development name, in spite of the use of prefixes or suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch and Beaufort County Dispatch have reviewed the proposed Barrier Beach Cove and have found that it does not duplicate street, vehicular access easement or development names.**

*Criteria B: It is desirable to use names which are simple, logical, easy to read and pronounce and which are clear and brief. Use of frivolous or complicated words or unconventional spellings in names shall not be approved.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that the proposed Barrier Beach Cove meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria C: It is desirable to use names which have some association with Hilton Head Island and specifically with the immediate location of the road or place, such as reference to local history or physiographic features.*

**This will bring the names in more compliance with the physiographic features of Hilton Head Island.**

*Criteria D: Use of a common theme is recommended for names of streets which are associated with one another, such as those within a residential development.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Barrier Beach Cove meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria E: Intersecting streets or vehicular access easements shall not have the same or similar name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County dispatch have determined that Barrier Beach Cove meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria F: Streets or vehicular access easements which continue through an intersection should generally bear the same name, except where the road crosses a major arterial or where existing address points on a street require that the roadway be given a different name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria G: A street or vehicular access easement making an approximate right-angle turn where there is no possibility of extending the street or vehicular access easement in either direction shall be considered to be continuous and be so named. Where there is a choice of direction or a possibility of extending either section in the future, such configuration shall be considered to be an intersection and different names assigned.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria H: The proposed name of the development should in all respects emphasize the project's distinctive name rather than the name of the company or corporation that owns the development. This will reduce confusion on the location of separate developments owned by the same company or corporation.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*I. New or modified street names should generally use Drive, Lane, Place, Road, Street or Way as suffixes. The following street designations should only be used if the street design meets one of the following descriptions:*

- 1. Alley--A street providing access to the rear of lots or buildings, usually as a secondary means of access to a property.*
- 2. Avenue--A street that is continuous.*
- 3. Boulevard--A street with a landscaped median dividing the roadway.*
- 4. Circle--A street with a complete loop on the end or a side street that intersects another street at two adjacent intersections.*
- 5. Court--A street terminating in a cul-de-sac, not longer than 1,000 feet in length.*
- 6. Extension--A section of street forming an additional length.*
- 7. Parkway--A street designated as a collector or arterial road, with a landscaped median reflecting the parkway character implied in the name.*

*This list is not intended to limit the use of other appropriate suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Barrier Beach Cove meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*J. The suffixes Manor, Trace and Common shall typically be used to name vehicular access easements.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*K. Existing roads that become broken by natural barriers, intervening land uses, or development that cause the existing road to become two separate roads, and are not likely to be reconnected in the future, shall be named in a manner that considers the potential economic impact of the number of address points and type of addresses impacted.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

**PREPARED BY:**

---

Suzanne Brown  
*Addressing Technician*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Randy Lindstrom  
*Administrative Battalion Chief*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Jayne Lopko, AICP  
*Planning Commission Coordinator &  
Senior Planner*

---

DATE



**TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

One Town Center Court

Hilton Head Island, SC 29928

843-341-4757

FAX 843-842-8908

**STAFF REPORT  
MODIFIED STREET NAME APPLICATION**

<b>Case #:</b>	<b>Name of Project or Development:</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>
STRNM120006	Burkes Beach Property Owner's Association (POA)	December 19, 2012

<b>Parcel Data or Location:</b>	<b>Applicant/Agent</b>
R511 012 000 0537 0000	Burkes Beach POA PO Box 4710 Hilton Head Island, SC 29938

**Application Summary:**

STRNM120006– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Fourth Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 52-56 and 70-71. The proposed name is Shore Crest Lane.

**Staff Recommendation:**

**Staff recommends the Planning Commission *approve* the Shore Crest Lane modified street name application based on the review criterion outlined in the Land Management Ordinance and enclosed herein.**

**Background:**

The current street names in the Burkes Beach Subdivision are more suitable for businesses and not a beach community. With the close proximity to the ocean, the subdivision would like to have more beach oriented names. These names are also unique and would help with safety response and deliveries.

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

**Findings of Facts:**

- Notice of the Modified Street Name Application was published in the Island Packet on November 11, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- Notice of the New Access Easement application was posted and mailed as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- A public hearing will be held on December 19, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1104A.
- The Commission has authority to render their decision reached here in LMO Section 16-3-1101B.

**Conclusions of Law:**

The Modified Street Name, notice requirements, and public hearing comply with the legal requirements as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111 and 16-3-1104A.

*As set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1105, Criteria for New or Modified Street and Vehicular Access Easement Names, requires that the Planning Commission, for final action, review proposed street names. This section also sets forth the criteria for this review as indicated below.*

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

*Criteria A: No new street, vehicular access easement or development project name, or proposed modified name of an existing street, vehicular access easement or development, except phases of the same development project, shall duplicate, be phonetically similar to, or in any way be likely to be confused with an existing street, vehicular access easement or development name, in spite of the use of prefixes or suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch and Beaufort County Dispatch have reviewed the proposed Shore Crest Lane and have found that it does not duplicate street, vehicular access easement or development names.**

*Criteria B: It is desirable to use names which are simple, logical, easy to read and pronounce and which are clear and brief. Use of frivolous or complicated words or unconventional spellings in names shall not be approved.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that the proposed Shore Crest Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria C: It is desirable to use names which have some association with Hilton Head Island and specifically with the immediate location of the road or place, such as reference to local history or physiographic features.*

**This will bring the names in more compliance with the physiographic features of Hilton Head Island.**

*Criteria D: Use of a common theme is recommended for names of streets which are associated with one another, such as those within a residential development.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Shore Crest Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria E: Intersecting streets or vehicular access easements shall not have the same or similar name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Shore Crest Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria F: Streets or vehicular access easements which continue through an intersection should generally bear the same name, except where the road crosses a major arterial or where existing address points on a street require that the roadway be given a different name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria G: A street or vehicular access easement making an approximate right-angle turn where there is no possibility of extending the street or vehicular access easement in either direction shall be considered to be continuous and be so named. Where there is a choice of direction or a possibility of extending either section in the future, such configuration shall be considered to be an intersection and different names assigned.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria H: The proposed name of the development should in all respects emphasize the project's distinctive name rather than the name of the company or corporation that owns the development. This will reduce confusion on the location of separate developments owned by the same company or corporation.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*I. New or modified street names should generally use Drive, Lane, Place, Road, Street or Way as suffixes. The following street designations should only be used if the street design meets one of the following descriptions:*

- 1. Alley--A street providing access to the rear of lots or buildings, usually as a secondary means of access to a property.*
- 2. Avenue--A street that is continuous.*
- 3. Boulevard--A street with a landscaped median dividing the roadway.*
- 4. Circle--A street with a complete loop on the end or a side street that intersects another street at two adjacent intersections.*
- 5. Court--A street terminating in a cul-de-sac, not longer than 1,000 feet in length.*
- 6. Extension--A section of street forming an additional length.*
- 7. Parkway--A street designated as a collector or arterial road, with a landscaped median reflecting the parkway character implied in the name.*

*This list is not intended to limit the use of other appropriate suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Shore Crest Lane meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*J. The suffixes Manor, Trace and Common shall typically be used to name vehicular access easements.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*K. Existing roads that become broken by natural barriers, intervening land uses, or development that cause the existing road to become two separate roads, and are not likely to be reconnected in the future, shall be named in a manner that considers the potential economic impact of the number of address points and type of addresses impacted.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

**PREPARED BY:**

---

Suzanne Brown  
*Addressing Technician*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Randy Lindstrom  
*Administrative Battalion Chief*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Jayne Lopko, *Planning Commission*  
*Coordinator*  
*Senior Planner*

---

DATE



**TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

One Town Center Court	Hilton Head Island, SC 29928	843-341-4757	FAX 843-842-8908
-----------------------	------------------------------	--------------	------------------

**STAFF REPORT  
MODIFIED STREET NAME APPLICATION**

<b>Case #:</b>	<b>Name of Project or Development:</b>	<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>
STRNM120007	Burkes Beach Property Owner's Association (POA)	December 19, 2012

<b>Parcel Data or Location:</b>	<b>Applicant/Agent</b>
R511 012 000 0537 0000	Burkes Beach POA PO Box 4710 Hilton Head Island, SC 29938

**Application Summary:**

STRNM120007– Burkes Beach POA has requested to modify the name of Fifth Street located off of Burkes Beach Road. Properties affected are on Beaufort County Tax Map 12 identified as parcels 72-73, 337-339, 22F, 616, 606, 218, and 122. The proposed name is Surf Watch Way.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the Surf Watch Way modified street name application based on the review criterion outlined in the Land Management Ordinance and enclosed herein.

**Background:**

The current street names in the Burkes Beach Subdivision are more suitable for businesses and not a beach community. With the close proximity to the ocean, the subdivision would like to have more beach oriented names. These names are also unique and would help with safety response and deliveries.

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

**Findings of Facts:**

- Notice of the Modified Street Name Application was published in the Island Packet on November 11, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- Notice of the New Access Easement application was posted and mailed as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111.
- A public hearing will be held on December 19, 2012 as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1104A.
- The Commission has authority to render their decision reached here in LMO Section 16-3-1101B.

**Conclusions of Law:**

The Modified Street Name, notice requirements, and public hearing comply with the legal requirements as set forth in LMO Section 16-3-110 & 111 and 16-3-1104A.

*As set forth in LMO Section 16-3-1105, Criteria for New or Modified Street and Vehicular Access Easement Names, requires that the Planning Commission, for final action, review proposed street names. This section also sets forth the criteria for this review as indicated below.*

**Summary of Facts and Conclusions of Law:**

*Criteria A: No new street, vehicular access easement or development project name, or proposed modified name of an existing street, vehicular access easement or development, except phases of the same development project, shall duplicate, be phonetically similar to, or in any way be likely to be confused with an existing street, vehicular access easement or development name, in spite of the use of prefixes or suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch and Beaufort County Dispatch have reviewed the proposed Surf Watch Way and have found that it does not duplicate street, vehicular access easement or development names.**

*Criteria B: It is desirable to use names which are simple, logical, easy to read and pronounce and which are clear and brief. Use of frivolous or complicated words or unconventional spellings in names shall not be approved.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that the proposed Surf Watch Way meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria C: It is desirable to use names which have some association with Hilton Head Island and specifically with the immediate location of the road or place, such as reference to local history or physiographic features.*

**This will bring the names in more compliance with the physiographic features of Hilton Head Island.**

*Criteria D: Use of a common theme is recommended for names of streets which are associated with one another, such as those within a residential development.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Surf Watch Way meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria E: Intersecting streets or vehicular access easements shall not have the same or similar name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Surf Watch Way meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*Criteria F: Streets or vehicular access easements which continue through an intersection should generally bear the same name, except where the road crosses a major arterial or where existing address points on a street require that the roadway be given a different name.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria G: A street or vehicular access easement making an approximate right-angle turn where there is no possibility of extending the street or vehicular access easement in either direction shall be considered to be continuous and be so named. Where there is a choice of direction or a possibility of extending either section in the future, such configuration shall be considered to be an intersection and different names assigned.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*Criteria H: The proposed name of the development should in all respects emphasize the project's distinctive name rather than the name of the company or corporation that owns the development. This will reduce confusion on the location of separate developments owned by the same company or corporation.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*I. New or modified street names should generally use Drive, Lane, Place, Road, Street or Way as suffixes. The following street designations should only be used if the street design meets one of the following descriptions:*

- 1. Alley--A street providing access to the rear of lots or buildings, usually as a secondary means of access to a property.*
- 2. Avenue--A street that is continuous.*
- 3. Boulevard--A street with a landscaped median dividing the roadway.*
- 4. Circle--A street with a complete loop on the end or a side street that intersects another street at two adjacent intersections.*
- 5. Court--A street terminating in a cul-de-sac, not longer than 1,000 feet in length.*
- 6. Extension--A section of street forming an additional length.*
- 7. Parkway--A street designated as a collector or arterial road, with a landscaped median reflecting the parkway character implied in the name.*

*This list is not intended to limit the use of other appropriate suffixes.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that Surf Watch Way meets the requirements of this criterion.**

*J. The suffixes Manor, Trace and Common shall typically be used to name vehicular access easements.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

*K. Existing roads that become broken by natural barriers, intervening land uses, or development that cause the existing road to become two separate roads, and are not likely to be reconnected in the future, shall be named in a manner that considers the potential economic impact of the number of address points and type of addresses impacted.*

**Town Staff, Fire & Rescue Dispatch, and Beaufort County Dispatch have determined that this does not apply to this application.**

**PREPARED BY:**

---

Suzanne Brown  
*Addressing Technician*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Randy Lindstrom  
*Administrative Battalion Chief*

---

DATE

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

Jayne Lopko, AICP  
*Planning Commission Coordinator &  
Senior Planner*

---

DATE



